

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has objected to language “a pressure wave that travels through said pressure vessel at sonic velocity”, as recited in claims 1 and 13, as introducing new matter into the disclosure of the invention.

Claims 1, 10-11, 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mizuno (U.S. 6,805,376); claims 2-5, 8-9, 12 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizuno in view of Rink et al. (U.S. 5,964,479); and claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizuno and Rink et al. and further in view of Starozihitsky et al. (U.S. 6,364,355).

The Examiner has indicated that claim 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Claim 13 has been amended herein to omit the reference to “sonic velocity” and to include the recitations of allowed dependent claim 18. Accordingly, claim 13 should now be allowable.

All of the other claims 1-12 and 14-18 in the present application have been cancelled.